The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 3, 2008. Claims 1-16 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 11, and 13 are in independent form. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-16 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-6, 9, and 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,625,598 (*Kraffert*); that Claim 7 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraffert* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036918 (*Pintsov*); that Claim 8 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraffert* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0049446 (*Seljeseth*); and that Claim 10 is rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kraffert* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0043636 (*Foster*). For at least the reasons presented below, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 11, and 13, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art.

Claim 1 is directed to a method to facilitate auditing of data in a database. Among other notable features of Claim 1 are the features of "creating an audit configuration including . . . an audit schedule, wherein the audit schedule indicates whether the audit is to be executed immediately upon the creating of the audit configuration or is to be executed at at least one predetermined date and time subsequent to the creating of the audit configuration, and wherein the audit schedule indicates whether the audit is a one-time audit or a recurring audit," and "executing the audit based at least in part on the audit configuration . . . ." By virtue of these features, a system implementing the method of Claim 1 enables a user to configure a complex audit and execute that audit repeatedly without being required to reconfigure the audit before

each use. For example, a travel broker may configure an automated and periodic audit of a particular inventory management and distribution system (IMDS) for travel supply service rates negotiated for a particular customer, thereby ensuring the accuracy of that customer's negotiated rates.[1] Moreover, by enabling configurable audits, a user can narrowly tailor which data is audited, thereby making the most efficient use of its auditing resources.

Kraffert, as best understood by Applicants, relates to a technique for data verification. *Kraffert* discloses querying a first database associated with a sales order entry program for first entries associated with a transaction. A second database associated with an accounting program is queried for second entries that are associated with the transaction. In response to the querying the first and second databases, a file is generated that indicates a comparison between the first and second entries. Apparently, the querying, rather than being configurable, is limited to querying entries relating to a specific invoice number.

Nothing has been found in *Kraffert* that would teach, suggest, or otherwise result in "creating an audit configuration including . . . an audit schedule, wherein the audit schedule indicates whether the audit is to be executed immediately upon the creating of the audit configuration or is to be executed at at least one predetermined date and time subsequent to the creating, and wherein the audit schedule indicates whether the audit is a one-time audit or a recurring audit," and "executing the audit based at least in part on the audit configuration . . . ," as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Kraffert*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 11 and 13 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least

---

[1] The example(s) provided herein are intended to be illustrative and are not to be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

the reasons discussed above. Additionally, the other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place the present application in condition for allowance. Therefore, entry of this Amendment is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and is respectfully requested, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for this Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 50-3939.

<div align="center">CONCLUSION</div>

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2504552_1